

Health Human Services—they get a waiver signed by the President that says you are going to have a 10-year exemption—10 years, no limit, and no work requirement. What a sham. What a shame. What a shame that this President and this administration would be so deceitful as to try to pull that over on the American people.

I am pleased that the Department of Health and Human Services realized their mistake. My guess is that the political people said, "Hey. This could come back to hurt us, or haunt us. Therefore, let us withdraw it."

I am pleased that the District of Columbia City Council, which never requested a 10-year waiver on work requirements, never requested a 10-year waiver on lifetime benefits—I am pleased that some of the council members realized that this is terrible. This would be a disaster for the District of Columbia. So I am pleased that evidently not only are they going to have some hearings but some Members think it would be a serious mistake, and they don't want the District of Columbia to become the welfare capital of the United States.

So I am pleased with the announcement of HHS today. I think the administration got caught in trying to have it both ways on welfare reform. To say "Yes, we need welfare reform with time limits and work requirements" while at the same time trying to undo welfare reform—to exempt work requirements, to exempt time limits—they should be ashamed of themselves. I am pleased they reversed themselves for about the fourth time on this issue.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

#### MARITIME SECURITY ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. INOUE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH). The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. INOUE. What is the pending business, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. H.R. 1350 is the pending business.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I just wanted to advise my colleagues that we have not received any requests to submit amendments on this side. Do we have any amendments pending at this moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are no amendments pending that the Chair is aware of.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. INOUE. Yes.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa is conferring off the floor concerning amendments that he may offer. So I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair. I will state to the Chair it will be about 30 minutes.

There being no objection, at 6:27 p.m., the Senate recessed subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate reassembled at 7:08 p.m., when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. SANTORUM).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. H.R. 1350. Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 8 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### FEDERAL WILDLIFE REFUGES

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, in the United States, there are 571 Federal wildlife refuges. There is only one State that doesn't have any, and that, unfortunately, is the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

To look at a couple of States that are comparable in the size of population to my State, Oklahoma has 9, Louisiana has 16, Alabama has 7.

Mr. President, it is pretty clear that Kentucky, when it comes to Federal wildlife refuges, has not been treated properly down through the years. I have been working on this issue since 1989. I introduced the first bill to create the first Federal wildlife refuge in Kentucky. It is not easy to find appropriate spots in the east. Many of our friends out west have more public land than they want. But in the east, it is not so.

We isolated—"we," working with the Kentucky Fish and Wildlife Service and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service—identified an area in Kentucky that makes sense. I introduced a bill which was reported out of the Environment and Public Works committee to authorize this refuge. It is my hope that the Interior appropriations bill will include both the authorization and appropriation to begin the acquisition.

Let me just say that no land will be condemned under this proposal. Only land will be purchased from willing sellers. That is a little bit different from the way some Federal wildlife refuges have been created. As a result of that, there is very minor opposition in our State to the creation of our first Federal wildlife refuge.

My dear colleague from Kentucky earlier today took to the floor to point out that this was not needed, and that we had another facility called the Land Between the Lakes—which is operated by the Tennessee Valley Authority; it

is a wonderful facility; a wonderful place—but that it really needed the money; and, if he were given the opportunity to do so, would offer an amendment to take the money away from the Federal wildlife refuge and give it to the Land Between the Lakes.

Mr. President, the Land Between the Lakes has already been given all the money they asked for. I am on the appropriations Subcommittee of Energy and Water which receives the request. We gave them all they asked for. They may ask for more someplace down the road, and it may be appropriate to give them more someplace down the road. But I do not think, particularly in these tight times, that it makes sense to throw money at a group, or a project, or an activity that is not asking for it.

So, if this amendment is offered at some subsequent time, obviously I am going to oppose it. I find it somewhat astonishing that my colleague would find it inappropriate for Kentucky to finally—it came into the Union in 1792—to finally have a Federal wildlife refuge.

It was suggested by my colleague that this was an incredibly controversial proposal. In fact, it is just the opposite. There are few who may oppose it, although if they own land in the area and don't want to sell they don't have to. And a wildlife refuge is a good neighbor. If you do not want to sell, it is a great neighbor to have right next to you. There is nothing that would keep any landowner in this area from keeping this property forever in this proposal.

There are 57 conservation groups and sportsmen from Kentucky who support this.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD, Mr. President.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### ORGANIZATIONS THAT HAVE ENDORSED THE CREATION OF THE KENTUCKY NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE

Appalachia Science in the Public Interest.  
Association of Chenoweth Run Environmentalists.

Audubon Society of Kentucky.  
Bell County Beautification Association.  
Berea College Biology Club.  
Brushy Fork Water Watch.  
Community Farm Alliance.  
Davies County Audubon Society & Kentucky Ornithological Society.

Department of Parks.  
Eastern Kentucky University Wildlife Society.

Elkhorn Land & Historic Trust Inc.  
Floyds Fork Environmental Association.  
Friends of Mill Creek.  
Gun Powder Creek Water Watch.  
Harlan County Clean Community Association.

Hart County Environmental Group.  
Highlands Group Cumberland Chapter Sierra Club.

Kentucky Academy of Science.  
Kentucky Association for Environmental Education.

Kentucky Audubon Council.  
Kentucky Citizens Accountability Project.  
Kentucky Conservation Committee.